UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,023	04/20/2001	Kannan Raj	INTL-0462-US(P9816)	2391

21906 7590 04/05/2006

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
8554 KATY FREEWAY
SUITE 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER	
SINGH, DALZID E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2613	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5/

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/839,023	RAJ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dalzid Singh	2613	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-15 and 17-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-15 and 17-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata (US Patent No. 5,500,857) in view of Li et al (US Patent No. 6,385,371).

Regarding claim 1, Asahi discloses optical WDM ring network, as shown in Fig. 1, comprising:

a least three interconnected processors for direct communication between said processors (in Fig. 1, Asahi shows plurality of nodes interconnected, each node comprises of processor as shown in Fig. 16; since each node comprises of processor and the nodes are interconnected, therefore the processors are also interconnected); and

an optical transceiver coupled to each processor, said transceiver including a wavelength division multiplexer to enable optical communications with the other processor (as shown in Fig. 16, Asahi shows transceiver; Asahi discloses WDM system, therefore the system uses wavelength for communication).

Nakata disclose optical communication system comprising of coupler as discussed above and differ from this claim in that Nakata does not specifically disclose that the coupler is elliptical coupler. However, it is well known that there are various

designs of optical reflector. Li et al is cited to show the well known concept of using elliptical coupler to reflect optical signal to optical fiber (Fig. 5 shows the use of elliptical reflector (62) to reflect optical signal to optical fiber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide elliptical coupler to the optical communication system of Nakata. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide such in order to maximize coupling efficiency.

Regarding claim 2, in Fig. 5A, Asahi shows optical transmitter includes a laser (402).

3. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata (US Patent No. 5,500,857) in view of Li et al (US Patent No. 6,385,371) and further in view of Huber (US Patent No. 6,687,428).

Regarding claim 7, as discussed above the combination of Nakata and Li et al disclose optical coupler and differs from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose that the coupler includes dispersive element to disperse the reflected light. Huber et al teach the use of dispersive element to disperse light after being reflected by the reflector (Fig. 4 shows dispersive element (38) to disperse light after being reflected by the reflector).

Regarding claim 8, as discussed in claim 7, furthermore, Huber et al show that the dispersive element includes a micro-mechanical structure (see col. 5, lines 46-48).

4. Claims 1-4, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata (US Patent No. 5,500,857) in view of Li et al (US Patent No. 6,385,371) and further in view of Asahi (US Patent No. 6,195,186) or Mo et al (US Patent No. 6,693,909).

Regarding claim 1, Nakata discloses optical communication system, as shown in Fig. 7, comprising:

an optical transceiver including a wavelength division multiplexer to enable optical communication with the other two transceivers (as shown in Fig. 7, Nakata shows multiple nodes (21-26), wherein each node comprises of optical transceiver, see col. 5, lines 32-35).

Nakata differs from these claims in that Nakata does not specifically disclose a processor coupled to each optical transceiver. However, it is extremely well known that optical transceiver comprises processor to process the signal. As disclosed by Nakata, since the nodes communicate by transmitting and receiving optical signal, therefore it would have been obvious that there exist processor to process the optical signal. Asahi and Mo et al is cited to show such well known concept. On Fig. 16, Asahi shows processor coupled to the data transceiver and on Fig. 3, Mo et al show processing system at the node. As evidenced by the prior arts, it is well known to provide processor at the nodes to process the signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to couple processor to the optical transceiver of Nakata. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do such in

order to efficiently control operation of the optical transceiver in transmitting and receiving of information signal.

Furthermore, since the optical transceiver within a node is connected to other optical transceiver at other nodes (for example, in Fig. 7, Nakata shows that the nodes are interconnected in a ring configuration), therefore processor of optical transceiver at one node location is coupled to other processor of optical transceiver located at other node locations.

Furthermore, the combination of Nakata and/ or Asahi and Mo discloses optical communication system comprising of coupler as discussed above and differ from this claim in that Nakata does not specifically disclose that the coupler is elliptical coupler. However, it is well known that there are various designs of optical reflector. Li et al is cited to show the well known concept of using elliptical coupler to reflect optical signal to optical fiber (Fig. 5 shows the use of elliptical reflector (62) to reflect optical signal to optical fiber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide elliptical coupler to the optical communication system of the combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide such in order to maximize coupling efficiency.

Regarding claim 2, in col. 5, lines 30-32, Nakata teach the that the optical transmitter includes a laser.

Regarding claim 3, in col. 5, lines 22-25, Nakata teaches the use of wavelength filter tunable to a particular input wavelength, which is located at the node.

Regarding claim 4, in col. 5, lines 42-45, Nakata teaches that each processor (processor within the node, see claim 1) is assigned a wavelength (for example, λ_1) for communicating with the other processors located at other node.

Regarding claim 9, in col. 5, lines 55-60, Nakata teaches that each optical transceiver within a node transmits a light beam together with a code identifying a sending and a receiving processor (the code is in a form of an address within the packet of the signal to indicate self address and destination address).

Regarding claim 10, in col. 17, lines 27-52, Nakata teaches that when one processor is receiving a wavelength division multiplexed signal from another processor, the one processor broadcasts to all other processors that the one processor is busy (since a busy signal is indicated by inserting a 1 into a frame pulse, which is transmitted and circulated around the transmission line, therefore busy signal is being broadcast form one optical transceiver containing processor to other optical transceiver containing processor).

5. Claims 11-15 and 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata (US Patent No. 5,500,857) in view of Asahi (US Patent No. 6,195,186) or Mo et al (US Patent No. 6,693,909).

Regarding claim 11, Nakata discloses optical communication system, as shown in Fig. 7, comprising:

an optical transceiver including a wavelength division multiplexer to enable optical communication with the other two transceivers (as shown in Fig. 7, Nakata

shows multiple nodes (21-26), wherein each node comprises of optical transceiver, see col. 5, lines 32-35); and

notifying a first processor when a second processor is receiving an optical communication from a third processor (in col. 17, lines 27-52, Nakata teaches notifying a first processor (node) when a second processor (node) is receiving a beam from a third processor (a busy signal inserted into a frame pulse is transmitted as a token to go around the transmission line; since the frame pulse goes around the transmission lines, therefore other nodes or processor is notified through the management table that a particular wavelength is being used).

Nakata differs from these claims in that Nakata does not specifically disclose a processor coupled to each optical transceiver. However, it is extremely well known that optical transceiver comprises processor to process the signal. As disclosed by Nakata, since the nodes communicate by transmitting and receiving optical signal, therefore it would have been obvious that there exist processor to process the optical signal. Asahi and Mo et al is cited to show such well known concept. On Fig. 16, Asahi shows processor coupled to the data transceiver and on Fig. 3, Mo et al show processing system at the node. As evidenced by the prior arts, it is well known to provide processor at the nodes to process the signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to couple processor to the optical transceiver of Nakata. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do such in order to efficiently control operation of the optical transceiver in transmitting and receiving of information signal.

Furthermore, since the optical transceiver within a node is connected to other optical transceiver at other nodes (for example, in Fig. 7, Nakata shows that the nodes are interconnected in a ring configuration), therefore processor of optical transceiver at one node location is coupled to other processor of optical transceiver located at other node locations.

Regarding claim 12, in col. 5, lines 42-45, Nakata teaches that each processor (processor within the node, see claim 1) is assigned a wavelength (for example, λ_1) for communicating with the other processors located at other node.

Regarding claims 13 and 22, in col. 5, lines 51-67 to col. 6, lines 1-12, Nakata teaches step including scanning for the wavelengths of any of said other processors (the optical frame pulse is received detect or scan for available wavelength).

Regarding claims 14 and 23, in col. 5, lines 51-67, Nakata teaches that the node transmitting a light beam having a predetermined wavelength, and transmitting a code that identifies the transmitting processor and the intended receiving processor (the code is the packet signal including the self and destination address which is converted to a particular wavelength, for example λ_a, and transmitted on the transmission line).

Regarding claims 15 and 24, in col. 6, lines 5-12, Nakata teaches that the receiving processor identifies the wavelength of the incoming beam and the code accompanying said beam, and locks to the wavelength of the transmitting processor (the node checks for available wavelength by identifying the wavelength of the incoming beam, which is included in the management table, if there is an available wavelength, then select or lock that wavelength for communication).

Regarding claims 17, 25 and 27, in col. 17, lines 27-52, Nakata teaches notifying a first processor (node) when a second processor (node) is receiving a beam from a third processor (a busy signal inserted into a frame pulse is transmitted as a token to go around the transmission line; since the frame pulse goes around the transmission lines, therefore other nodes or processor is notified through the management table that a particular wavelength is being used).

Regarding claims 18 and 26, in col. 18, lines 33-38, Nakata teaches indicating when said second processor is no longer communicating with said third processor (processor within the nodes informs other nodes when communication is finished or completed).

Regarding claim 19, in col. 5, lines 53-67, Nakata teaches using a code (for example, packet containing self and destination address) transmitted by the third processor (node) to determine if a given processor (node) is the intended recipient of a beam transmitted from the third processor (the recipient processor receive the address and determine whether the transmitted signal is intended for it).

Regarding claim 20, as discussed above, since the communication signal is transmitted in optical form (for example, wavelengths are transmitted from one node to the other nodes), therefore the processors (node) are optically interconnected.

Regarding claim 21, Nakata discloses optical communication system, as shown in Fig. 7, comprising:

identify a light communication from a node intended for said first node (in col. 5, lines 51-67 to col. 6, lines 1-28, Nakata teaches that wavelength between the nodes are assigned to be different wavelengths);

tune to said wavelength (each of the nodes are tuned to the assigned wavelength, see col. 5, lines 43-50); and

notifying a first processor when a second processor is receiving an optical communication from a third processor (in col. 17, lines 27-52, Nakata teaches notifying a first processor (node) when a second processor (node) is receiving a beam from a third processor (a busy signal inserted into a frame pulse is transmitted as a token to go around the transmission line; since the frame pulse goes around the transmission lines, therefore other nodes or processor is notified through the management table that a particular wavelength is being used).

Nakata differs from these claims in that Nakata does not specifically disclose a processor coupled to each optical transceiver. However, it is extremely well known that optical transceiver comprises processor to process the signal. As disclosed by Nakata, since the nodes communicate by transmitting and receiving optical signal, therefore it would have been obvious that there exist processor to process the optical signal. Asahi and Mo et al is cited to show such well known concept. On Fig. 16, Asahi shows processor coupled to the data transceiver and on Fig. 3, Mo et al show processing system at the node. As evidenced by the prior arts, it is well known to provide processor at the nodes to process the signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to couple processor to the optical

transceiver of Nakata. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do such in order to efficiently control operation of the optical transceiver in transmitting and receiving of information signal.

Furthermore, since the optical transceiver within a node is connected to other optical transceiver at other nodes (for example, in Fig. 7, Nakata shows that the nodes are interconnected in a ring configuration), therefore processor of optical transceiver at one node location is coupled to other processor of optical transceiver located at other node locations.

Regarding claim 28, in col. 5, lines 4-21 and 40-42, Nakata teaches the use optical communications and wavelength division multiplexing.

Regarding claim 29, in col. 5, lines 43-50, Nakata teaches that the first processor-based system (node) to communicate with other processor-based systems (node) using an assigned wavelength (for example, λ_1 is used for communication between node 22 to node 25).

Regarding claim 30, in col. 5, lines 51-57, Nakata teaches that the first processor-based system (node) to transmit a code (a code or packet containing self and destination address) that identifies said first processor-based system (node) and an intended receiving processor-based system (node).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 17 January 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On the remark, applicant indicates that Nakata's tokens are for transmitting only. They have nothing to do with receiving. Nakata teaches transmitting and receiving tokens along the optical transmission path (see col. 5, lines 51-67 to col. 6, lines 1-42).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Riser et al (US Patent No. 5,857,041) is cited to show optical coupler and method utilizing optimal illumination reflector.

Cohen et al (US Patent No. 6,075,913) is cited to show optical coupler.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalzid Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3029. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DS
April 1, 2006
Dabrid Singh